IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA BRUNSWICK DIVISION

CARY G. MOSELEY, JR.,

Plaintiff,

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 2:16-cv-153

v.

JEFF SESSIONS, in his Official Capacity as Attorney General of the United States,

Defendant.

ORDER

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's Objection/Motion for Reconsideration, (doc. 34), of the Court's May 1, 2017, Order, (doc. 31). For the reasons set forth below, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion.

A motion for reconsideration, or a Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) motion, is "an extraordinary remedy, to be employed sparingly." Smith ex rel. Smith v. Augusta-Richmond Cty., No. CV 110-126, 2012 WL 1355575, at *1 (S.D. Ga. Apr. 18, 2012) (internal citation omitted). "A movant must set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to induce the court to reverse its prior decision." Id. (internal citation omitted). "The only grounds for granting a Rule 59 motion are newly-discovered evidence or manifest errors of law or fact." Jacobs v. Tempur-Pedic Intern., Inc., 626 F.3d 1327, 1344 (11th Cir. 2010) (quoting In re Kellogg, 197 F.3d 1116, 1119 (11th Cir. 1999) (internal punctuation omitted)). "A Rule 59(e) motion cannot be used to relitigate old matters, raise argument or present evidence that could have been raised prior to the entry of judgment." Id. (quoting Michael Linet, Inc. v. Village of Wellington, 408 F.3d 757, 763 (11th Cir. 2005) (alterations omitted)).

The Court discerns no reason to grant Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration. Here, Plaintiff does not present any newly-discovered evidence or manifest errors of law or fact. The Court already discussed at length the law supporting its holding that Plaintiff cannot, at this time, request even partial discovery of Ms. Tracey Jermon. (Doc. 31, pp. 5–6). The Court sees no error in that analysis, much less clear error warranting reconsideration.

For all the above-stated reasons, as well as those included in the Court's May 1, 2017, Order, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration and the Order dated May 1, 2017, (doc. 31), remains the Order of the Court.

SO ORDERED, this 25th day of May, 2017.

R. STAN BAKER

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA